DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 737 FL 006 770

AUTHOR Shuy, Roger W.
TITLE Code Switching in "Lady Chatterly's Lover."
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association (New York City, December 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; Behavior Theories; *Dialects; *Dialogue; Language Variation; Linguistic Theory; *Literary Analysis; Oral Communication; Social Behavior; *Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS *Linguistic Code Switching

ABSTRACT

The language or dialect used in a conversation will vary according to the social situation, the identity of the participants, and the conversational topic. Bilinguals will often switch languages to suit the topic or the listener; persons who speak both standard and dialect forms of a language will use the standard in formal conversation and the dialect when discussing local issues with local people. This linguistic code-switching theory is applied to D. H. Lawrence's "Lady Chatterly's Lover" to examine the author's use of language in the novel. Several conversations involving Lady Chatterly, Sir Clifford Chatterly, Mellors the gamekeeper, and others are analyzed. It is observed that Mellors, the only character to use code-switching regularly, speaks standard English with Sir Clifford and others, but often uses a Derbyshire dialect with Lady Chatterly to convey intimacy, to confuse her, or to exert power over her. He alternates between standard English and Derbyshire to suit his purpose. That Lawrence employed this linguistic switching consciously is illustrated by his accuracy and his authorial comments on language. The theory of code-switching and similar linguistic developments may be of some use in literary analysis. (CK)

ED105737

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Code Switching in Lady Chatterly's Lover

Roger W. Shuy
Georgetown University and
The Center for Applied Linguistics
MLA- December 1974

In multilingual societies it has been suggested that the use of all the available linguistic forms is a prerequisite for full participation in the community (Gumperz 1964:206-7). That is, in a French/English bilingual community, it is necessary for members of the community to know and speak both languages if they are to obtain the maximum status and benefits possible in that community. Recent research in bilingualism, in fact, has focussed on exactly how this code-switching actually takes place. Innumerable interesting questions present themselves to linguists in this regard, usually involving the when's, the how's, the where's, the who's and the how much's of such switching. The assumption, of course, is that code switching is not random and that certain social conditions create the need and dictate the procedures for engaging in it. Gumperz goes so far as to state that "...alternation does carry meaning" (1971:316) and that the very act of switching serves social and semantic functions.

The concept of "communicative competence" (Hymes 1967) involves the recognition that speakers have the ability to use their speech varieties for specific functions, social or linguistic. The actual investigation of communicative competence in various language contact situations has been relatively recent and not carried very deeply in many language learning situations. For example, the effective learner of a second language may well acquire effective or native-like phonology or grammar in a second language but never acquire a working knowledge of the crucial language functions that will enable him to open and close conversa-

FL006770

tions, infer meaning from contexts in which that meaning is not explicitly carried by the lexicon, interrupt, cajole and many other language functions which have been shown to be critical measurement points of communicative adequacy. Likewise, little or no attention has been given the question of the social benefits which can accrue to the foreigner who preserves certain phonological or grammatical flavorings from his native language as he acquires a second tongue. It appears even heretical to suggest that a second language learner may be tolerated in a different way or even be tolerated preferentially if the native speakers are given adequate signals of his foreignness.

Research on alternation between codes has indicated rather clearly that such behavior is rule-governed (Ervin-Tripp 1972). The regularities which are shown to result from such alternation relate to factors which make up the individual speech events. Such factors include topic, code, situation and participants (Hymes 1972:58-65).

Topic (what is being talked about) has been discussed in the context of code-switching on several occasions (Ervin-Tripp 1972; Fishman 1972; Gumperz 1964; Hymes 1972) and empirically analyzed by Ervin-Tripp 1964, by Gumperz and Blom 1971 and Strick 1973. In each case the research related code-switching to dominant and second languages as a function of topic.

Ervin-Tripp (1964) investigated the effect of variation of topic and receiver on switching between Japanese and English. Interviews with Japanese immigrants were conducted by Japanese and Caucasian Americans. If the listener was Japanese and the topic related to American culture, the speaker seemed to have no difficulty if speaking English. On the other hand, if the interviewer was Japanese and the topic related to Japanese culture, the conversation in English was less perfect syntactically, less fluent and was punctuated by Japanese borrowings. Ervin-Tripp concluded that changes in topic and listener had marked effect on the formal features of speech (1964:97).

Similarly in their research on code-switching in the speech of

California Chicanos, Gumperz and Hernandez (1971) found that a socially identifiable topic often determined which code the bilingual would select. For example, whenever Chicano identity was an underlying theme, Spanish was used. In an earlier study of the effect of topical variation on code-switching in a small Norwegian village (1964 and 1971) Gumperz concluded that of the two dialects spoken in that village, the local one was preferred in issues related to community identification while standard Norwegian was used in topics which were more national in scope. The effect of topic was carried even further when Gumperz and Blom indicated that code-switching would not occur in friendly gatherings of people who composed a net work of local relationships, even if topic is varied. On the other hand, if both local and non-local relationships obtain, code-switching could occur based on topical variation. Thus the speakers' verbal strategy of conveying social information is revealed by switching from the local dialect to the standard.

The systematic study of code-switching by linguists usually involves the following techniques: anonymous observations (Gumperz 1964:171-2; Gumperz and Blom 1971), individual informant interviews (Labov 1966; Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968) and small-group elicitation or discussion sessions (Gumperz 1970; Labov 1970:46-49). As far as can be determined, little or no work has been done by linguists in studying the already written observation of code-switching by sensitive writers. The hypothesis of the present study is that a sociolinguistic theory of code-switching can be applied not only to the examination of real conversational data, whether elicited surreptitiously or in interview contexts, but also to the written representation of such real conversational data by competent authors. By applying what is known about code-switching as rule-governed behavior we should be able to determine the degree to which a given author consistently represents this rule-governed behavior and, to the extent which he is consistent or inconsistent, evaluate that author's innate sociolinguistic effectiveness. For the sociolinguist, the information being examined (a novel, a short story

or a poem) may be little more than a new batch of data through which he can crank and test his sociolinguistic theory and machinery. To the literary critic, however, the results of recent research in communicative competence in general and in this case, to code-switching in particular, offer a new and objective instrument for analyzing an author's consistency in representing reality, for examining a writer's subtle shifts of intention or indications of characterization. It has long been observed that great authors write better than they know. One would assume from such a statement that writers not only internalize sociolinguistic rules, language functions and formal language knowledge but that they also make use of such features without really being able to say what it is they are doing as they do it. This is not surprizing to linguists who have long marvelled at how well children acquire their native language without having the foggiest notion of how to describe this knowledge to others. It might be argued, of course, that such behavior is not really writing better than an author knows (depending on how knows is defined); it is, rather, writing better than his ability to describe his ability to write. A sociolinguistic analysis of literature promises nothing to the writer in this case but it does offer a theory and methodology for discussing what it is that a writer does and how well he does it.

In order to illustrate the usefulness of the knowledge of code-switching in a literary context, we have selected D.H. Lawrence's novel, Lady Chatterly's Lover, which contains one of the classis literary instances of dialect shifting. Mellors, the gameskeeper in the household of Lord and Lady Chatterly, speaks what Lawrence describes as broad Derbyshire dialect on many occasions. On the other hand, he is also known to speak a rather standard version of English, perhaps as a result of his being "...attached to some Indian colonel who took a liking to him" when he served as a Lieutenant in the British Army. We get a glimpse of this linguistic situation when Lady Chatterly asks her husband: "How could they make him an officer when he speaks broad Derby-

shire?". To this Sir Clifford replies: "He doesn't...except by fits and starts. He can speak perfectly well, for him. I suppose he has the idea if he's come down to the ranks again, he'd better speak as the ranks speak.". This speech certainly reflects the observations of sociolinguistic researchers on how social information is revealed by language switching. It is also a strong indication that Lawrence was probably consciously aware of this sociolinguistic principle. What remains is to observe how well he carried it out in his representations of the speech of his characters.

The codes involved in Lady Chatterly's Lover are assumed to be two homogeneous and clear-cut dialects of English. This raises one theoretical and terminological problem for linguists, whose definition of code historically has usually mean two separate non-mutually intelligible language systems. It is not at all clear that Gumperz uses the term this way, however, and a good case can be made for lumping code-switching with dialect-switching (sometimes called style shifting) in terms of their roles and effects. Regardless of exact terminological precision, it appears that the two language systems in contrast are a kind of standard English versus a broad Derbyshire dialect. Lawrence is relatively clear in the instances in which he wishes his reader to perceiver the dialogue as being in the latter dialect. The accuracy of his representation will not be at issue here but suffice it to say that the phonology of this dialect is represented in spellings (yer for you, waitin' for waiting, 'adn't for hadn't, a' for all, Ah for I, pleece for place, ax for ask, abaht for about, ma'es for makes, etc.). Occasionally, the orthographic representation appears to be mere eye dialect as in th' for the, du for do and anuther for another, but generally speaking, Lawrence represents broad Derbyshire pronunciation rather consistently. The grammar of the dialect is predictably non-standard, with double negatives (Sir Clifford 'adn't got no other key then?), non-standard verb usages (Ah thowt it wor ordinary.) and local syntactic forms ('Appen Sir Clifford 'ud know). The standard dialect is characterized primarily by a regularity of orthography

and grammar but primarily by the absence of the marked forms of broad Derbyshire such as those noted above. In the minds of writers, as apparently, in the minds of most speakers, standard is primarily the absence of stigmatized forms (Shuy 1969).

In terms of the settings and participants involved in the switching, Mellors speaks only standard English to Sir Clifford, Sir Malcom and Mrs. Bolton. He speaks standard English to Hilda until she insults him at which point he answers her in dialect. He also speaks dialect to Hilda primarily when she is a visitor in his house. He speaks local dialect consistently to his dog and to his penis on the occasions which he addresses it as a person. It is only when Mellors switches in speaking to Lady Chatterly that clarification is required.

As noted above, topic also is an essential factor in code-switching. Consistently throughout the novel certain topics are discussed by Mellors in standard English only. Whenever the topic of Lady Chatterly's proposed trip to Venice is introduced (three separate occasions), Mellors discusses it only in standard. The same can be said for the topics of sex (mutual orgasm, his libido and any memories of their past sexual experiences), three discussions about their philosophies of life, Mellor's personal background, the topic of divorce (four times) and discussions about what constitutes good English. Three times the topic of Mellor's first wife is discussed in standard English and once in dialect. Likewise, once Mellors discusses his work as gameskeeper in standard and once in dialect. More personal topics, however, are generally discussed in dialect, including his relationship with his daughter, the general topic of children and any philosophical discussions relating to the hardship of the life of a peasant.

In terms of language situations or functions, the consistent contrast between standard English and dialect in Mellor's speech is maintained. Introductions, conversational openings, conversational closings, insults, invitations to sex and rejection of sexual overtures are in standard English, while all representations of meal-time conversation, talk during love-

making and post-intercourse afterglow conversations were in dialect.

The novel contains twelve major speech events, separated by descrip ve phrases and authorial narrative. The term speech event, as used here, will refer to extended conversations in which switching is potential or actually takes place. The four major ingredients for code-switching will be noted for each speech event.

Speech Event 1. (in Chapter V)

Topic: Sir Clifford introduces Lady Chatterly to Mellors.

Participants: Sir Clifford, Lady Chatterly, Mellors.

Setting: Sir Clifford's home (Wragby)

Code: Standard English (SE).

One hint of switching or potential switching comes from Lawrence who notes that Mellors corrected himself on one occasion:

"But you've been here some time, haven't you?"

"Eight months, Madam--your Ladyship!" he corrected himself calmly.

In addition, Lawrence comments on the nature of Mellors' speech:

"And do you like it?"

"Why yes, thank you, your Ladyship. I was reared here..."

His voice on the last words had fallen into the heavy broad drag of the dialect...perhaps also in mockery because there had been no trace of dialect before.

Speech Event 2. (in Chapter VIII)

Topic: Discussion about the hut in the woods. It was used by Mellors but Lady Chatterly found it a nice place to come and sit when taking a walk. They discuss whether or not she can/should use it and whether or not he should stop using it as a work center.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: At the hut in the woods.

Code: Primarily vernacular. Mellors uses SE only in response

to Lady Chatterly's question about why he should worry about whether or not she needs the hut to herself:

"Why should I take any notice of you and your being here or not? Why is it important?"--

..."It's not, your Ladyship. Not in the very least."

Lady Chatterly is not satisfied with this answer and pursues the point again:

"Well why then?"

to which Mellors changes the subject:

"Shall I get your Ladyship another key then?"

She responds with an emphatic no, indicating clearly that it is impudent of Mellors to think that she would even want to come there. At this point, Mellors returns to the vernacular:

"Oh'll get it anyhow. We'd best 'ave two keys ter th' place."

Lady Chatterly is furious. She calls him insolent and Mellors, still in the vernacular, denies that he ever had any untoward intentions and plays the role of the ignorant and humble worker:

"I niver meant nuthink. Ah on'y thought as if yo' come 'ere, Ah s'd 'ave ter clear out, an' it 'd mean a lot of work, settin' up somewheres else..."

Lawrence comments, as this speech event ends, that Lady Chatterly is in total bewilderment:

> She was not sure whether she had been insulted and mortally offended, or not. Perhaps the man really only meant what he said; that he thought she would expect him to keep away. As if she would dream of it! And as if he could possible be as important, he and his stupid presence.

The effect of Mellors' switching is clear. He uses SE in the role of chastized servant, similar to a butler stereotype, offering SE noises with little more than functional rather than semantic intent (a sort of "As you wish, Madam--Whatever Madam desires"). In such a role, he

can perfectly legitimately assume the accompanying role of professional ignorance. Just as it was within Mellors' character of ignorant, humble servant to ask if she wanted a key, it was also within his province as ignorant, humble gameskeeper to reject her denial and say that he'd have one made anyway. The passive butler, SE speaking role would not permit this sort of ignorance. It would have required a passive acceptance with an "As you wish, your Ladyship". To force the key upon Lady Chatterly he had to switch servant roles to that of the even more ignorant and humble outdoorsman, who would not have to passively accept. The gameskeeper could legitimately misunderstand, even to the extent of countermanding her wishes.

Small wonder that Lady Chatterly left the setting in confusion. She had been dealing with at least two surface role representations (formal and informal servants) as well as the real Mellors, whoever he might turn out to be. The role shifting had served Mellors well. At the onset of this conversation he had dazzled her with what Lawrence called "the fog of the dialect". Her reaction was to question:

"Why don't you speak in ordinary English?"

to this, Mellors responds:

"Me! Ah thowt it wor' ordinary."

In contrast to speech event number 1, the second speech event is vernacular dominated. The topic shifts from stylized speech functions of event number 1 to the local topic involving the nature and responsibilities of the gameskeeper's work. The setting shifts from Sir Clifford's house in event number 1 to the gameskeeper's work hut in number 2, a more amenable place to the use of vernacular. The participants also vary, and Mellors' pattern of never switching in the presence of Sir Clifford is firmly established. From the perspective of the sociolinguist, these events show realistic predictability. The scenes described by the novelist might well have been tape recordings of real-life conversations. From the perspective of the literary critic, this exercise offers a useful evaluation instrument for the effectiveness of a writer in reflect-

ing the reality he attempts to depict. The performance of any creator of literature is a struggle with form. Writing demands conformity and restricts freedom in the interests of the formal mechanism. The illusion of reality in conversation in one of the measures of authorial validity. Lawrence might have narrated these scenes without conversation, using the vision of the outsider. Instead, he chose to use the vision of the insider and, in doing so, makes himself vulnerable to the charge of artificiality or inconsistency.

Speech Event 3. (in Chapter X)

Topic: Mellors' obtaining a key to the hut for Lady Chatterly and a brief discussion of the hut's function (involving the hens).

Participants: Mellors and Lady Chatterly.

Setting: At the hut in the woods.

Code: SE entirely.

This speech event was a minor one in which little conversation takes place. Lawrence narrates the event, primarily, giving the reader an outside version, particularly of Lady Chatterly's enjoyment of an identification with the hens which she visited ("... They were the only things in the world that warmed her heart.").

Speech Event 4. (in Chapter X)

Topic: The hens; how they had multiplied.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: At the hut in the woods.

Code: SE, switching to vernacular.

Again, the hens, especially their symbolization of warmth, life and feminine tenderness, affect Lady Chatterly greatly. She cries. Mellors is moved, touches her shoulder and moves his hand down her back, then invites her into the hut. Inside, he instructs her to lie down and then he lies down beside her. Their first intercourse follows, with all conversation in standard English. It is not until they are past that Mellors

begins to use vernacular. They discuss the complications of their behavior and the concept of love. Then Lady Chatterly asks:

"But you don't hate me, do you?"

Mellors responds: "Nay, nay," in Derbyshire dialect.

Speech Event 5. (in Chapter X)

Topic: Sex, being found out, their relationship.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: At the hut.

Code: Vernacular, switching to SE, back to vernacular, back to SE, back to vernacular and back to SE.

The scene opens with Mellors coming upon Lady Chatterly who was sitting in the hut:

"You come then," he said, using the intonation of the dialect.

Mellors continues to use the dialect throughout their discussion of whether or not people will discover them. He introduces sex in standard but returns to dialect during and after their intercourse. Lawrence exerts the authorial perspective only once, when he notes that Lady Chatterly resented the dialect: "His 'Tha mun come' seemed not addressed to her, but some common woman.". As they discuss her leaving, however, Mellors returns to standard: "'It's quarter past seven,' he said, 'you'll do it.' He had changed his voice.", Lawrence reports. But at their parting, he lusts for her touch again, and says so in dialect. They embrace, then separate, and his leave taking returns to standard: "Goodnight, your Ladyship.".

Speech Event 6. (in Chapter X)

Topic: Mellors' libido and their own sex act.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: On the road.

Code: Entirely in SE.

Mellors intercepts Lady Chatterly and almost forcibly takes

her into the woods to a clearing suitable for sex. She receives him passively but, uncontrollably, she climaxes almost in spite of herself. They discuss this phenomenon entirely in SE.

Speech Event 7a. (in Chapter XII)

Topic: His work, her proposed trip to Venice, their sex experience, their relationship.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: Mellor's cottage.

Code: SE opening comments, falling into dialect at the meal ("Shall y'ave something?"), returning to standard when Mellors discusses his work (Lawrence notes: "He spoke cold, good, English.") and when they talk about her proposed trip. Mellors remains in standard as they discuss their past sex experiences and the possibility of their having used each other. The sex invitation, as usual, is in standard but they decide to go to the hut rather than to have intercourse at his cottage after dinner. Lady Chatterly then left and went home.

Speech Event 7b. (in Chapter XII, immediately following Speech Event 7a)

Topic: The hens, sex introduction, afterglow smalltalk.

Participants: Lady Chatterly and Mellors.

Setting: At the hut.

Code: After greetings in standard, Mellors invites her into the hut in dialect ("Shall us go i' th' 'ut?"). Their sex preparation discussion appears to be in standard, but it is difficult to ascertain Lawrence's exact intended representation ("Have you left your underthings off?" appears to be quite standard). Once he touches her, however, the dialect comes forth ("Eh, thar't nice!"). After intercourse, dialect dominates, as usual, even to his evaluation of her performance. As they separate, she cries out for him, leading to intercourse again, which she fully participates in this time and climaxes fully. The afterglow conversation is, as usual, in dialect. This time, however, Lady Chatterly also tries to

speak the dialect:

"Tha mun come one naight ter th' cottage, afore tha goes; sholl ter?"...

"Sholl ter?" she echoed, teasing.

He smiled.

"Ay, sholl ter?" he repeated.

"Ay!" she said, imitating the dialect sound.

"Yi!" he said.

"Yi!" she repeated.

"An slaip wi' me," he said. "It needs that. When sholt come?"

"When sholl I?" she said.

"Nay," he said, "tha canna oo't. When sholt come then?"

"'Appen Sunday," she said.

"'Appen a' Sunday, Ay!"

He laugned at her quickly.

"Nay, tha canna," he protested.

"Why canna I?" she said.

He laughed. Her attempts at the dialect were so ludicrous, somehow.

"Coom then tha mun go!" he said.

"Mun I," she said.

"Maun Ah!" he corrected.

"Why should I say maun when you said mun," she protested. "You're not playing fair."

It appears in this speech event that Lawrence is using dialect to describe Mellors' power over Lady Chatterly. Here, as elsewhere, their touch is accompanied by the almost immediate occurrence of dialect. As usual, sexual afterglow conversation is also in vernacular. But in this event, Lady Chatterly is so into the setting that she actually begins to speak the dialect. Though treated somewhat playfully by Lawrence, it appears to represent a significant signal on Lawrence's part that Mellors has achieved some sort of power over her.

Speech Event 8. (in Chapter XIII)

Topic: The predicament of the breakdown of Sir Clifford's motorized wheelchair.

Participants: Lady Chatterly, Sir Clifford, Mellors.

Setting: On the road.

Code: Standard English entirely. Most of the conversation is between Mellors and Sir Clifford but even the talk between Mellors and Lady Chatterly is in standard.

In this speech event Mellors assumes the role of the indoor servant, responding disinterestedly and passionlessly to Sir Clifford's insults and childish behavior. After the worst of the behavior, Sir Clifford speaks:

"Do you mind pushing her home, Mellors!" he said in a cool superior tone. "I hope I have said nothing to offend you," he added in a tone of dislike.

"Nothing at all, Sir Clifford!"

Speech Event 9. (in Chapter XIV)

Topic: Sir Clifford, Mellors' dog, Mellors' wife, divorce and marriage, types of intercourse, lesbians, their past sex life.

Participants: Lady Chatterly, Mellors, his dog, his penis.

Setting: They meet at the gate to her house, then walk to Mellors' cottage.

Code: The opening conversation, as always, is in standard. Their discussion of the wheelchair incident, his past pneumonia and Sir Clifford's lack of manhood are in SE. Mellors speaks vernacular to his dog, but discusses dogs with Lady Chatterly in standard. He talks about his wife in dialect, switching back to standard when the topic of divorce is broached. Standard English continues through the following topics (his first girl friend, types of intercourse, lesbian women and a clinical analysis of their own sex experiences). He becomes somewhat morose and rejects the notion of their sleeping together. On his way out of the room he looked at Lady Chatterly, touched her, and erected his dialect once again:" "Ma little lass!

Dunna let's fight! Dunna let's niver fight! I love thee an' th' touch on thee. Dunna argue wi' me. Dunna! Dunna!" As they prepare for intercourse, she admires his penis, at which point Mellors addresses it in dialect: "Ay ma lad! Tha'art thee right enough. Yi, the mun rear thy head! Theer on thy own, eh? An' ta'es no count o' nobody!" The post-intercourse conversation is, again, in dialect, fading to a rather weakly represented standard English in the closing and leave-taking setting.

Speech Event 10. (in Chapter XV)

Topic: Her future trip to Venice, the colonies, Lady Chatterly's possible divorce, wealth, the Army colonel for whom Mellors once worked, tameness in men, children, hardship, life.

Participants: Lady Chatterly, Mellors, Mrs. Bolton.

Setting: At the hut.

Code: Frequent switching.

At first, the topics of the forthcoming trip, the colonies, her possible divorce, wealth, the Army colonel and male tameness are conducted in standard English. Then Lady Chatterly says: "Tell me you want a child...". Mellors' answer begins in standard but moves quickly into dialect as he ruminates about children and the hardships of life. While he talks, she handles his genitals but fails to arouse him. As his talk moves more and more away from the hardships of a collier's life to a more philosophical discussion of the doom of all mankind, his speech becomes increasingly standard. Lady Chatterly was in no mood for such moroseness and she broke the mood by taking off her clothes and running out into the rain. This was enough for Mellors. He followed suit and caught her on the path where they had intercourse, in the driving rain. Afterward, they go back to the hut and the afterglow conversation is, as always, in dialect. After a while Lady Chatterly asks: "You don't mind, do you, that I'm going away?". With a blank expression he answered: "You do as you wish.". Lawrence observes: "And he spoke in good English." The topics of her trip to Venice and the possibility of her divorce

from Sir Clifford. Suddenly he goes outside to pick some flowers to playfully accomplish his mock wedding of his "John Thomas" to her "Lady Jane". This topic sends Mellors back into dialect:

"This is John Thomas marryin' Lady Jane," he said. "An' we mun let Constance an' Oliver go their ways..."

His thought along with his dialect is interrupted by his sneeze, after which he talks about shirts, in general, in standard as he puts his own shirt on. He laments that perhaps his Lady Jane will meet someone else in Italy. She tells him not to say such things and he returns to dialect as he talks to "Lady Jane" (rather than to Lady Chatterly) as though she were a separate person. Lawrence observes: "She never knew how to answer him when he was in this condition of the vernacular.". A few sentences later, as they are walking back toward Wragby, they meet Mrs. Bolton. Mellors says goodnight to both in proper standard English.

Speech Event 11. (in Chapter XVI)

Topic: Introductions, table talk, normal English, the risk involved in the affair, insulting, afterglow.

Participants: Lady Chatterly, Mellors, Hilda (Lady Chatterly's sister).

Setting: In a car, then at Mellors' cottage.

Code: Frequent switching.

Hilda and Lady Chatterly are driving. They meet Mellors, park the car and walk to the cottage. All conversation is in standard until Hilda sits in Mellors' chair. Lady Chatterly tells her to move and Mellors responds: "Sit yer still.". The meal is conducted in dialect (put on rather heavily, it appears). Hilda asks why he speaks Yorkshire. He tells her it is Derby:

"Derby, then! Why do you speak Derby? You spoke natural English at first."

"Did Ah though? An' canna Ah change if Ah'n a mind to 't? Nay nay, let me talk Derby if it suits me. If you'n nowt against it."

"It sounds a little affected," said Hilda.

"Ay, 'appen so! An' up i' Tevershall you'd sound affected." Hilda continued to observe Mellors, concluding, at last, that he was acting.

"Still!" she said as she took a little cheese. "It would be more natural if you spoke to us in normal English, not in vernacular."

"Would it?" he said in normal English. "Would it? Would anything that was said between you and me be quite natural...?".

Lawrence notes here that Hilda was baffled and annoyed: "After all, he might show that he realized he was being honored. Instead of which, with his play-acting and lordly airs, he seemed to think it was he who was conferring the honor." Mellors continues briefly in standard until Hilda asks him if the risk of the affair is worth it. His answer is in dialect, which he stays in until Hilda insults him. His response is in calculated standard: "But you deserve what you get: to be left severely alone." Hilda stalks out leaving Lady Chatterly and Mellors alone. She initiates love making and he moves back into dialect through intercourse and afterglow talk.

Speech Event 12. (in Chapter XVIII)

Topic: Lady Chatterly's return from Italy, what happened while she was away.

Participants: Lady Chatterly, Sir Malcolm, Hilda.

Setting: At a hotel (first alone with Lady Chatterly, next with Sir Malcolm [her father] and last with Hilda [her sister]).

Code: Predominantly SE, with switches into vernacular.

The greeting behavior, as Lady Chatterly and Mellors first meet after a long absence, is stiff and standard:

"Ah, there you are! How well you look!"

They discuss how it was for him while she was gone. He talks about how little he has to offer her in a clinical, standard fashion. He observes that the world is artificial and fickle and that it is touch that we are all afraid of. She says, "Then hold me". He does and then begins to use dialect.

Then she asks if he still loves his wife. He answers in standard and continues in it after both Sir Malcolm and Hilda come in. He cannot bear the scheme which they propose to protect his name and his in his near despair at the whole affair: "I agree to anything. The world is a raving idiot." Then he looks at Lady Chatterly and says in dialect:

"Ma lass! The world's goin' to put salt on thy tail."

Conclusion:

Two basic questions have been addressed in this analysis of the use of code-switching by D. H. Lawrence in Lady Chatterly's Lover.

1. Can an author represent a linguistically complex phenomenon such as code-switching in a realistic fashion?

Research in code-switching has clearly indicated that social conditions create the need for varying one's language use. Those who have at their disposal a range of codes, whether languages or dialects, seem to be the speakers who are advantaged. In the case of language code-switching, however, the bilingual must adjust to the language of the monolingual if any communication is to take place at all. In at least one sense of the term, the bilingual thus moves to a point of disadvantage, especially if the language being used is not his native tongue. In terms of power, he is forced to use his less powerful code by the ignorance of the monolingual. The power condition involved in code-switching does not always work in this way, however, especially when the codes are mutually intelligible dialects of the same language. In the case of Lady Chatterly's Lover, the vernacular and the standard are mutually comprehensible. That is, speakers of both dialects have receptive competence in both dialects. The middle class speakers have productive compentence only in standard. Mellors has productive competence in both. The only person capable of using language variability to provide alternation and thereby to create meaning from function itself is the speaker who can speak (and is allowed to speak) two dialects. Only Mellors has the right to switch roles from the standard speaking inside servant to the vernacular speaking woodsman, since his

servant roles overlap in both areas. Because of his unique background, he can also switch into a standard speaking non-servant role. As the non-local participant, his right to switch is established. In a sense, Mellors is the only participant in the novel who can enjoy the luxury of providing meaning by the very act of code-switching. He can insult, reject, withdraw, refuse to answer, disobey, mock, hide and perform many other functions, all through the meaning offered by switching in sharp contrast with the semantic meaning of the words being used.

Linguists have little examined the power relationship offered by this sort of control dictated by code-switching. Mellors exhibits it beautifully, in a type of linguistic fencing which parries, thrusts and feints with the greatest artistry. He can deny his own worth and his own surreptitious intentions while at the very moment have a key made for Lady Chatterly to meet him at their trysting place. He can seduce her in standard English, then excuse his behavior with the very vernacular which he is using to make the excuse. He can keep Lady Chatterly confused about their relationship by referring to her as "ma lass" and "your Ladyship" in the same speech event, at the same time permitting this very switching to be the cover for any indescretions for which he might be guilty. And when his cover falls in danger of being exposed ("Why don't you speak in ordinary English?"), Mellors can, in his very switching, hide more truth than that which is hidden by his answer ("I thowt it wor ordinary.").

Mellors' ultimate power created through code-switching, however, seems evident in the intercourse scenes. As noted earlier, the introduction to intercourse is in standard English in each of the eight major intercourse scenes in the novel. Mellors' conversation after intercourse is invariably in the vernacular. Lady Chatterly's language is predictably standard throughout the novel but evidence of her coming under Mellors' power seems to be apparent in intercourse scene number five (in Speech Event 7b.) when, after climaxing explosively, she begins to try to speak Mellors' vernacular. He finds it charming but, somehow ludicrous, and

feels obliged to play school teacher to her by correcting her inability to speak the vernacular accurately.

In answer to the first question posed by this investigation, then, we can observe that not only does Lawrence represent the linguistically complex situation of code-switching with accuracy, but that he also makes use of the basic understandings of code-switching as the critical vehicle for motivation in the novel. That is, Lawrence portrays code-switching in a manner which parallels that which might have been revealed by tape recordings of real life conversations. Even without the benefit of research on the rule-governed alternations in code-switching, Lawrence has caused Mellors' speech to vary consistently according to the major factors which subsequent research has demonstrated to be critical. Not only has Lawrence done this with amazing perception, however, he has also made use of its basic truths upon which to build the major action and assumptions of the story.

2. Does the sociolinguist have a contribution to make to literary criticism?

It is always presumptuous of members of one academic community to claim that members of a different community will survive and prosper only if the latter learn the secrets of the former. Such is not necessarily the claim of this paper, although it seems apparent that the presumed advantages of recent efforts at disciplinary segregation have proved to be specious. Disciplines leak. It is difficult for many linguists to determine exactly what field they really belong in. Whether or not it wants to be, language is involved in philosophy, psychology, history, sociology, mathematics, anthropology, literature and education, to name only a few disciplines.

It is hoped that nothing in the current analysis is an attack on what literary critics do or do not do. The analysis of code-switching is relatively new even to sociolinguists and it is in no way fruitful to criticize a field for not doing something that is not being done elsewhere.

What this paper hopes is that certain tasks of the literary critic will

be aided by recent theoretical developments in sociolinguistics. Specifically, literary critics can be helped to ascertain how effectively and how consistently an author protrays the language of his fictional characters. Recent developments in conversational analysis can provide a scientific touchstone (in well-defined contexts) for literary comparison. One type of analysis might have been to match the orthographic representation of broad Derbyshire dialect with the linguistic Atlas research which has been done in that area. In this case, we have chosen rather to make use of a measurement point which is less concerned with the surface manifestation of language representation (the phonology and frammar) and more concerned with the meaning, particularly the sort of meaning which may or may not be consciously controlled by the author. If we had analyzed for former question we could learn about how well the author knew the dialect he represented. The latter question gets at a much larger issue: How well does the author know how to make use of the uses of language.

A second type of question with which sociolinguistics can provide assistance to the literary critic is in the broad area of authorial awareness. A legitimate question often asked of authors is the extent to which they remember, mimic or otherwise write with structural integrity without apparent artistic intention. That is, how much did Lawrence really know about what he was doing with conversation in Lady Chatterly's Lover? Did he write from remembered fragments and native "feel" or was he aware of the consequences of code-switching as he developed the dialogue?

In the case of this novel, it is clear that Lawrence must have been aware of the patterned structure of conversational rules. Not only does he structure code-switching along the patterns dictated by analysis of actual code-switching in non-fictional contexts, but he also makes authorial-voice comments on the language being used, for example:

"His voice on the last words had fallen into the heavy broad drag of the dialect...perhaps also in mockery because there had been no trace

of dialect before." (Chapter V)

"He spoke cold, good English," Chapter (XII)

"Her attempts at the dialect were so ludicrous, somehow." (Chapter XII)

"And he spoke in good English." (Chapter XV)

"She never knew how to answer him when he was in this condition of the vernacular." (Chapter XV)

These and other instances of the authorial voice offer supporting evidence for the belief that Lawrence knew exactly what he was doing as he did it. Even when he put evidences of how language functions carry meaning in the words of his characters we get a clear picture of authorial knowledge and intention. The marvellous conversation about code-switching in Speech Event 11 is ample evidence of this. Hilda accuses Mellors of switching (apparently Hilda was the only character who was conscious enough of the phenomenon to be able to isolate it for conversation). Mellors responds (in vernacular) that he can switch if he wants to. To Hilda's suggestion that his Derbyshire dialect sounds affected, Mellors responds: "An' up i' Tavershall you'd sound affected.". This sophisticated insight has been overlooked for decades in this country and it is no credit to either English or Linguistics Departments that it is so little understood some half-century after it was written.

In summary, then, it should be repeated that recent developments in sociolinguistic analysis offer analytic assistance to the field of literary criticism. Unfortunately, the analysis performed in this paper tells us little that we did not already know about Lawrence's considerable abilities as a novelist. What it does provide is a way of capturing and discussing that ability in measurable terms, perhaps as a point for comparing that same ability in other authors but at least as a way of more concretely describing what it is that Lawrence did so well. Perhaps this is all that science can ever offer art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternational and Co-occurrence." Directions in Sociolinguistics. Edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

_____. "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic and Listener." The Ethnography of Communication. American Anthropologist. Edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. LXVI, No. 6. Part 2 (December 1964) 86-102.

Fishman, Joshua A. "Domains and the Realtionship Between Micro- and Macro-Sociolinguistics." Directions in Sociolinguistics. Edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Gumperz, John J. "Verbal Strategies in Multilingual Communication." Report of the 21st Annual Round Table Meeting on Languages and Linguistics. Edited by James Alatis. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

_____. "Linguistic and Social Internation in two Communities." (1964) Language in Social Groups. Edited by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1971.

_____ and Jan-Petter Blom. "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-Switching in Norway." (1971) Language in Social Groups. Edited by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1971.

_____ and Eduardo Hernandez. "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism, and Classroom Interaction." (1971) Language in Social Groups. Edited by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1971.

Hymes, Dell. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life." Directions in Sociolinguistics. Edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

_____. "On Communicative Competence." Sociolinguistics. Edited by J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1970.

Labov, William. "The Study of Language in its Social Context." Studium Generale, XXIII (June 1970) 30-87.

Labov, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Lawrence, D.H. Lady Chatterly's Lover. New York: Signet, 1959.

Shuy, Roger W., Walter Wolfram and William K. Riley. Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

_____. "Subjective Judgements in Sociolinguistic Analysis." Report of the 20th Annual Round Table Meeting on Languages and Linguistics. Edited by James Alatis. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1969.

Strick, Gregory J. "Arabic-English Code-Switching." M.A. Thesis, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon, 1974.